

they breathe more air per pound of body weight than adults do. Nearly 4.5 million American children suffer from asthma, and air pollution is believed to be a serious contributing factor in asthma attacks, bronchitis, and emergency room visits.

One of the most insidious forms of air pollution is diesel exhaust, which contains over 40 potential carcinogens, as well as fine soot particles that can get lodged deep in the lung. The Clean Air Task Force recently released a report which found that fine particle pollution shortens the lives of nearly 21,000 people each year, and leads to lung cancer, heart attacks, and asthma attacks. For New Jersey's children alone, the report linked diesel pollution to over 540 emergency room visits due to asthma and nearly 1,300 cases of acute bronchitis each year.

Although school buses are far and away the safest way for children to travel to school, the diesel exhaust from school buses puts our children at unnecessary risk. A number of programs already exist to try to cut down our children's exposure to school bus exhaust, such as New Jersey's "Stop the Soot" initiative to reduce bus idling, and the Environmental Protection Agency's Clean School Bus campaign, which provides grants for school districts to purchase new, cleaner buses, or to retrofit old buses with pollution control equipment.

These programs are doing an excellent job reducing the amount of pollution our children are exposed to while they're waiting for the bus or just playing outside. But some recent studies have made it clear that our children have more to worry about inside a school bus than just who to sit next to. Researchers from Yale University, the University of Connecticut, the University of California, and Purdue University have found that the concentration of air pollution inside school buses can in some cases be far higher than outside the bus. And the evidence suggests most of the pollution is coming from the bus' own exhaust. One study published in March of this year suggests that in some cases the amount of exhaust inhaled by children on a school bus is greater than the amount of that bus' exhaust inhaled by all other people in a metropolitan area.

We know a lot about how to control emissions from the tailpipe. But we don't know a lot about how to control emissions inside the bus. We don't know how the pollution gets into the bus, and we don't know the best ways to stop it. That's why I'm introducing this legislation, which will direct EPA to do a comprehensive study of air quality inside school buses, and come up with the most effective strategies for keeping the pollution out. This bill also greatly increases the authorization level of EPA's Clean School Bus program, and makes sure that school districts can use grant money from that program to implement the strategies that fight in-bus pollution.

Mr. Speaker, this bill calls attention to an overlooked aspect of our fight for clean air, and it is targeted at those people who are most vulnerable to air pollution—our children. It creates no new requirements on school districts or municipalities; it simply gives them the tools necessary to make their school buses as healthy for children as possible. I ask my colleagues to join in me supporting this legislation, because dirt in a school bus should mean mud in the aisles, and not soot in the air.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 2005

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, on July 11, 2005, I missed rollcall votes Nos. 363 and 364. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on H. Con. Res. 168 and H. Res. 333.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LYNN A. WESTMORELAND

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 2005

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 29, and Thursday, June 30, I was attending a hearing of the Base Realignment and Closure Commission in the state of Georgia regarding the proposed base closures and realignments for the southeastern states. I had the opportunity to testify on the importance of bases in Georgia, and particularly how vital Fort Benning is to my district and to our national security.

Due to my efforts in fighting for bases in the state of Georgia, I was unable to vote on some of the amendments proposed to the Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development FY06 Appropriations legislation (H.R. 3058).

On the amendment of Mr. KING of Iowa, rollcall Vote No. 341, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

On the amendment of Ms. HERSETH of South Dakota, rollcall Vote No. 342, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

On the amendment of Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, rollcall Vote No. 343, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

On the amendment of Mr. SOUDER of Indiana, rollcall Vote No. 344, had I been present, I would have voted yes.

On the amendment of Mr. DAVIS of Florida, rollcall Vote No. 345, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

On the amendment of Ms. LEE of California, rollcall Vote No. 346, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

On the amendment of Mr. SANDERS of Vermont, rollcall Vote No. 347, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

On the amendment of Mr. RANGEL of New York, rollcall Vote No. 348, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

On the amendment of Mr. SOUDER of Indiana, rollcall Vote No. 349, had I been present, I would have voted "yes." I strongly support Second Amendment rights, and the ensuring that the people have the right to personal protection. I strongly support allowing the people of the District of Columbia to defend themselves, and the crime prevention results it will bring. I applaud Mr. SOUDER for bringing this amendment, and its passage will be helpful to the people of the District.

On the amendment of Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, rollcall Vote No. 350, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

On the amendment of Ms. DELAURO of Connecticut, rollcall Vote No. 351, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

MILITARY PERSONNEL FINANCIAL SERVICES PROTECTION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JIM RYUN

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 2005

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favor of H.R. 458, the Military Personnel Financial Services Protection Act. This legislation, sponsored by the gentleman from Kentucky, would establish procedures to protect our servicemembers from predatory practices sometimes employed by members of the financial services industry.

I want to specifically express support for Section 110 of the bill, which establishes a method for our military base commanders to obtain the information that they need to keep these problematic agents off their installations without neglecting their servicemembers of access to legitimate financial service providers.

Specifically, Section 110 creates a registry at the Department of Defense to list any agent that has been barred from entry onto any military installation. This registry will be made available to base commanders everywhere, empowering them to deny access to an agent known to employ predatory practices elsewhere.

I want to thank Mr. DAVIS and Chairman OXLEY for including the language I authored in Section 110. This language, coupled with the other provisions in the bill, will go a long way towards protecting our servicemembers from those who would prey on them financially. I encourage my colleagues to support this effort.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 2005

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 11, on account of district business I was absent for votes on roll call numbers 363 and 364. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both.

INTRODUCTION OF THE CAREGIVER ASSISTANCE AND RELIEF EFFORT (CARE) ACT, LEGISLATION PROVIDING CAREGIVER ASSISTANCE

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 2005

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce The Caregiver Assistance and Relief Effort (CARE) Act. This bill addresses the needs of families that are making sacrifices to care for their loved ones by making long-term care more affordable. It would provide tax credits to those caring for ailing family members and loved ones, and encourage individuals to plan and invest in their own long-term care by offering a tax deduction for long-term care insurance. In addition, it would double the funding for the existing National Family